

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

PRG



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,019	04/05/2001	Jeffrey McCaskey	88835.022400	4834

7590 07/15/2004

Thomas R. FitzGerald, Esq.
 JAECKLE FLEICHMANN & MUGEL, LLP
 39 State Street
 Rochester, NY 14614-1310

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/827,019

Applicant(s)

MCCASKEY ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the statement "The cost of news delivery and software maintenance is low" purports the merits of the invention. This statement should be removed or reworded.

. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Figure 18, as mentioned in the disclosure, has not been included in the application. A proposed drawing correction or corrected

drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

- Figure 4, elements 522 and 508b
- Figure 5, elements 611, 604, 639a, and 639d
- Figure 6, elements 711 and 704
- Figure 7, elements 811 and 804
- Figure 8, elements 911, 904, 932a, 933a, 931a, 934a, 935a, and 935b
- Figure 8a, elements 951, 952, 961, 959, 960, 975, 972, 953, 954, 990, 985, and 985a
- Figure 11, element 133b
- Figure 17, element 350

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

- first parts 608a referenced on Page 15, line 17

- Web page template 700X referenced on Page 13, line 2, Page 16, line 13, Page 28, lines 14 and 31, and Page 29, lines 6 and 9

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 24, the limitation "news image library" from claim 4 is recited, however, claim 4 allows for the choice of data files from a group in which "news image library" is only one possible selection. It is unclear as to the limitations of this claim if a different choice is made from the group of possible data files.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2176

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-15, 24-34, 44-45, 47-48, 51-52, 54, 56-58, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1).

As per claim 1, Ferrell discloses an apparatus for translating and composing news text and images from a printed publication electronic format to a format displayable on a web browser (see Ferrel, Column 7, lines 5-9, Column 3, lines 47-67, and Column 35, lines 23-32). This system includes a server with memory and secondary storage that is used for storing, converting, organizing and displaying news information on the Web. (See Ferrel, Figure 2, and Column 10, lines 17-33). This system includes a means for receiving a plurality of print publication electronic files comprising news story text data and news story image data. (See Ferrel, Figure 3, and Column 4, lines 16-25, and Column 8, lines 62-64). This system includes publication storage, equivalent to an editorial database, which stores information extracted from print publication electronic files. This system also includes a means for extracting text information from the print publication electronic files, located on the publisher workstations, and converting and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2). This system also includes a publishing program for extracting the text information from the publication storage, converting it to a format suitable for display on the Web, and storing it in a set of

newspaper story text files capable of being displayed at a news Website on the World Wide Web. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 41-67, and Column 12, lines 1-5).

As per claim 2, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a plurality of templates used to organize the display of the news text files and edited news files on the Web. (See Ferrel, Column 15, lines 55-59). Ferrel also teaches a set of news Web pages that can be displayed on the World Wide Web. (See Ferrel, Figure 6, and Column 17, lines 18-30).

Claim 3 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

As per claim 4, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the print publication electronic files comprise data files which contain stories or pictures (See Ferrel, Column 8, lines 62-64), which are included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 4.

As per claim 6, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a news image conversion program, incorporated in the Designer Component, which extracts, converts, and stores image information. (See Ferrel, Column 10, lines 34-47, and Column 23, lines 58-64).

As per claim 10, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a means of drafting and editing the contents of the publication storage, associating the text data with image files and initiating the text extraction and publication programs. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 7-15, Figure 5, and Column 23, lines 51-57).

As per claim 12, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that each template contains a number of lists of links to other news stories and news Web pages. (See Ferrel, Figure 7).

As per claim 13, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the list of links contains a link to each section of the news. (See Ferrel, Figure 7, and Column 18, lines 7-10).

As per claim 14, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the list of links contains a link to each topic of the news in a single section of the news. (See Figure 7).

As per claim 15, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the templates comprise one or more templates consisting of a topic Web page template for presenting a number of news stories related to that topic, which is included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 15. In the example shown by Ferrel, the Business section is presented. (See Ferrel, Figure 8, and Column 19, lines 40-52).

As per claim 24, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that graphics files are stored in a content folder which holds picture objects used by a project. (See Ferrel, Column 18, lines 6-9) This is equivalent to a news image library which is included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 4. Ferrel further discloses that the graphics files are associated to each other by means of a directory structure. (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 402).

As per claim 25, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the text data files contain news story data, formatting information, in the form of tags, which define the appearance of the data, and descriptive information defining the content of the data, in the form of a find properties object stream. (See Ferrel, Column 4, lines 16-32, and Figure 14).

As per claim 26, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the formatting information is stored in the form of codes (i.e. tags) of a text markup language. (See Ferrel, Figure 14).

As per claim 27, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Ferrel also shows tags for a markup language that are defined as HTML tags. (See Ferrel, figure 14, and Column 32, lines 5-16. The tags shown by Ferrel are MPML tags. MPML is a version of HTML 2.0 – See Ferrel, Column 3, line 65).

As per claim 28, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the descriptive information is stored in the form of codes (i.e. tags) of a text markup language. (See Ferrel, Column 31, lines 59-67, and Column 23, lines 1-4).

As per claim 29, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the markup language used is MPML, which is a version of HTML 2.0 – See Ferrel, Column 3, line 65).

As per claim 30, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the descriptive information is stored in the form of keywords in the text of the news story. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 48-52).

As per claim 31, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news Web pages comprise text files. (See Ferrel, Column 4, lines 16-20).

As per claim 32, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the text files contain information that can be updated or modified when the file is displayed. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41).

As per claim 33, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news Web pages comprise image files. (See Ferrel, Column 8, lines 2-4).

As per claim 34, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that this system consists of a separate conversion computer, with its own main and secondary memory as is inherently true in the art, used to organize the text data files into news Web pages, and a Web server, also with its own main and secondary memory as is inherently true in the art, used to retrieve, update, and display the news Web pages for a reader. (See Ferrel, figure 3, Column 12, lines 27-67, and Column 13, lines 1-36).

As per claim 44, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the templates contain code executable only on the server(s). (See Ferrel, Figure 11, and Column 24, lines 16-62).

As per claim 45, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that each template includes embedded directives for substitution of

template content with the contents of other files which contain story data. (See Ferrel, Column 18, lines 33-42, and Figure 8).

As per claim 47, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the publisher, as shown in Ferrel, Figure 1, releases the project which contains the formatted story text. This makes the project files available on the network. (See Ferrel, Column 16, lines 49-57).

As per claim 48, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses the use of a Project Editor program and Designer program to create a story Web page with embedded story text and images in a story Web page template, a main Web page template, a section Web page template and a topic Web page template. (See Ferrel, Column 17, lines 50-67, Column 18, lines 1-13, Figure 7 and Figure 8).

Claim 51 is rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 3.

As per claim 52, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51. Ferrel also discloses a method for extracting text information from the print publication electronic files, located on the publisher workstations, and converting and storing the information in publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 58-67, and Figures 1 and 2).

As per claim 54, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses the step of proofing news electronic files to change their appearance and organization. (See Ferrel, Column 16, lines 9-21).

As per claim 56, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 54 as described above. Ferrel also discloses extracting, converting and storing story text information, providing

Art Unit: 2176

a means for a proofreader to initiate a process for database retrieval, conversion and formatting of news text and image information for display on the Web, and providing a means for a proofreader to direct news text and image information formatted for display on the Web to a local caching object store which serves as a test news Website before publication of the Web page. (See Ferrel, Figure 11, Figure 12, and Column 24, lines 37-62).

As per claim 57, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses retrieving the Web page template files and news story information files, executing commands to replace the template directives with specific news text file electronic contents retrieved from the database, retrieving image electronic data files from the image library and story the combined edited news text files and image files in a set of edited news electronic Web pages for display on the Web. (See Ferrel, Figure 1, Column 9, lines 9-41, Column 10, lines 34-47, Column 23, lines 58-64, and Figure 4).

As per claim 58, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a method for retrieving stored edited news electronic Web pages for display to a Web user, executing program code in the edited news electronic Web pages to store current server information in the retrieved Web pages, and transmitting the edited news electronic Web pages with current information to the Web user. (See Ferrel, Figure 11, Figure 12, and Column 25, lines 21-51).

As per claim 63, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news information is published to a server that can be connected to the Internet, thus providing the news Web pages on a daily basis to the

Art Unit: 2176

World Wide Web for presentation to Web users. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 26-37, and Column 24, lines 58-62).

As per claim 64, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the news Web pages can be delivered to the World Wide Web for presentation to Web users on the basis of changes in news information. (See Ferrel, Column 11, lines 26-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 41-43, and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) as applied to claims 1 and 51 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 6,449,616 B1).

As per claim 5, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel does not disclose expressly an electronic news subscriber database for storing electronic mail addresses and information preferences of electronic news subscribers. Walker discloses a method for readers of newspapers, or similar printed media to obtain supplemental information, or portions of information, in the articles. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 46-54). Walker also discloses that this information is distributed to subscribers using electronic mail. The electronic mail addresses and

preferences of the subscribers are stored in a subscriber database. (See Walker, Column 8, lines 66-67, and Column 9, lines 1-24). Ferrel and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber database of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

As per claim 41, Ferrel and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Walker also discloses that the subscriber database is a relational database. (See Walker, Column 7, lines 52-54). Ferrel and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the relational subscriber database of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with rapid responses to requests for supplemental information. (See Walker, Column 7, lines 53-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel for the benefit of providing timely responses for information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 41.

As per claim 42, Ferrel and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 41 as described above. Walker also discloses that the relational subscriber database has a table of subscriber information. (See Walker, Figure 3d). Ferrel and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber information table of Walker with the electronic news publication system utilizing a relational subscriber database, as disclosed by Ferrel and Walker. The motivation for doing so would have been to store subscriber data necessary to effect the dissemination of information requested by a subscriber. (See Walker, Column 9, lines 17-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel for the benefit of storing subscriber data needed to distribute requested information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 42.

As per claim 43, Ferrel and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Walker also discloses that the subscriber or user database contains files, or records, that contain data related by virtue of their content. (See Walker, Figure 3d). Ferrel and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the related records contained in the subscriber information table of Walker with the electronic news publication system utilizing a relational subscriber database, as disclosed by Ferrel and Walker. The motivation for doing so would have been to store subscriber data necessary to effect the dissemination of information requested by a subscriber. (See

Walker, Column 9, lines 17-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel for the benefit of storing subscriber data needed to distribute requested information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 43.

As per claim 61, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel does not disclose expressly the step of selecting and sending news information to news subscribers via electronic mail. Walker discloses that news information is sent to subscribers by a delivery means as specified by the subscriber. (See Walker, Column 11, lines 43-51). Walker also discloses that the delivery means can be electronic mail. (See Walker, Figure 3D, element 292). Ferrel and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber news delivery method of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 61.

As per claim 62, Ferrel and Walker disclose the limitations of claim 61 as described above. Walker also discloses a means for a number of subscribers to request electronic mail presentation of news information. (See Walker, Figure 3D, elements 281 and 292). Walker also discloses a means for a subscriber to specify his or her selection criteria for news topics to be delivered. (See Walker, Figure 5a and

Column 9, lines 48-59). Walker also discloses a means for extracting the news information selected by the subscriber. (See Walker, Figure 4, element 410, and Column 9, lines 32-47). Walker also discloses that a mail message is prepared and transmitted to each subscriber requesting electronic mail presentation of news information. (See Walker, Figure 7, and Column 11, lines 37-51). Ferrel and Walker are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the subscriber news delivery service of Walker with the electronic news publication system of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide readers with a particular area of interest an automated means of receiving information electronically. (See Walker, Column 4, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Walker with Ferrel for the benefit of providing customized information to a set of readers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 62.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1).

As per claim 7, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a content editor to edit information contained in the text files. (See Ferrel, Figure 12). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a classified advertisement database containing classified advertisement information, a classified notices program

for editing text classified advertisement information, or a classified notices maintenance program for updating edited classified advertisement information. Kovack discloses a method for generating an electronic newspaper that includes a predefined page information database for a classified advertisement page. (See Kovack, Page 1, paragraph 0007, lines 16-23, Page 2, paragraph 0025, lines 1-2, and Page 4, claim 1). Ferrel and Kovack are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the predefined page information database for a classified advertisement page of Kovack with the content editing program of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method to easily update information contained in the electronic publication that might require changes without having to update the page layout. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kovack with Ferrel for the benefit of editing classified advertisements in an electronic publication to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

As per claim 8, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a content editor to edit information contained in the text files. (See Ferrel, Figure 12). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a death notices database containing death notice information or a death notices program for editing text death notice information. Kovack discloses a method for generating an electronic newspaper that includes a predefined page information database for an obituary page. (See Kovack, Page 1, paragraph 0007, lines 16-23, Page 2, paragraph 0025, lines 1-2, and

Art Unit: 2176

Page 4, claim 1). Ferrel and Kovack are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing news information electronically via the Web. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the predefined page information database for an obituary page of Kovack with the content editing program of Ferrel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method to easily update information contained in the electronic publication that might require changes without having to update the page layout. (See Ferrel, Column 9, lines 33-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kovack with Ferrel for the benefit of editing obituary information in an electronic publication to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Claim 9 is rejected on the same basis as claims 7 and 8.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Riley (U.S. Patent 1,090,346).

As per claim 16, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of baseball box scores, top news stories of one section of the news, the relative team standings of a plurality of baseball leagues, football box scores, or the relative team standings of a plurality of football leagues. Riley discloses a method of presenting tabulated baseball score results in a form useful for publishing, which is included in the group of possible items set forth by the applicant in claim 16. (See Riley,

Art Unit: 2176

page 1, Column 1, lines 40-43, and figure 1). Ferrel and Riley are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying sports scores in a printed media. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel with the baseball box scores of Riley. The motivation for doing so would have been to present the baseball scoring results in a concise manner suitable for a limited amount of space. (See Riley, page 1, Column 1, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Riley with Ferrel for the benefit of condensing baseball score information to be presented in a published media to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Jones (U.S. Publication 2001/0047373 A1).

As per claim 17, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of a bridal Web page template, an entertainment Web page template, a movie reviews Web page template, a cartoon Web page template, or a travel Web page template. Jones discloses the inclusion of cartoons in an online information display system. (See Jones, page 7, paragraph 0070). Ferrel are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information in an electronic format. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel with the cartoon images

of Jones. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the reader of an electronic publication with the cartoon images in a layout that allows them to view both the image and any associated text simultaneously. (See Jones, page 1, paragraph 0010, and page 7, paragraph 0070). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Jones with Ferrel for the benefit of enhanced viewing of text and image data in an electronic format to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,301,574 B1).

As per claim 18, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the templates are used to present data from the group consisting of an archival Web page for presenting an entry allowing a reader to search the news story archive. Thomas discloses a system for providing information, applicable to an online newspaper application, which can be used in conjunction with a searching device to conduct searches of online news archives. (See Thomas, Column 10, lines 32-38). Ferrel and Thomas are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing useful information in an electronic format. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the page templates of Ferrel with the archival search of Thomas. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a reader with the means to search for information from a large source of data to find specific topics of interest to the

reader. (See Thomas, Column 10, lines 41-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomas with Ferrel for the benefit of providing a means of searching a large amount of news archival data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Claims 11, 19, 21-23, 49-50, 55, and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) as applied to claims 1, 10, 51, 54 above, and further in view of Dabney (6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 11, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses an archiving program using containers for multiple projects. This program allows for the extraction, conversion, and storage of the text information. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 38-51, and figure 4). Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the text information is stored in an electronic news archive. Dabney discloses a content management system in which news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Since news information is collected and stored electronically on the relational database as disclosed by Dabney, this database serves as an electronic news archive. Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the news text and image translation and composition apparatus of Ferrel with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data

contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As per claim 19, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the editorial database, or publication storage, resides on a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables"), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data storage system of Ferrel with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

As per claim 21, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel does not disclose expressly a set of maintenance subprograms for updating

information stored in the editorial database. Dabney discloses a content management system in which news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Dabney also discloses that this data is maintained and edited by a plurality of content servers (See Dabney, Figure 3B, and Column 7, lines 3-4). The content server allows editors to electronically update the data. (See Dabney, Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-33 and Figure 11). Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the means for editing the contents of the editorial database of Ferrel with the content server programs of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of an interface that would enable an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Claim 22 is rejected on the same basis as claim 11.

As per claim 23, Ferrel and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that the files, or titles, are contained in folders that are related by content. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 58-67).

As per claim 49, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a story finding maintenance Web page providing a list of headlines for a given day allowing a proofreader the ability to create a link to a specific story in the

database. (See Ferrel, Figure 7, Column 17, lines 50-67, and Column 18, lines 1-14).

Ferrel also discloses a headline maintenance Web page which would enable a proofreader or editor to place stories on a section Web page in order of importance.

(See Ferrel, Column 27, lines 56-67, Column 28, lines 1-3, and Figure 12, element 690).

Ferrel also discloses a means for changing the published status of stories in the editorial database to permit their republication on the news Website. This is done using the "find properties" which include important information about the document. (See

Ferrel, Figure 12, and Column 28, lines 14-40). Ferrel also discloses a means which would enable a proofreader to associate images with a specific story in the editorial database. (See Ferrel, Column 15, lines 55-67, and Column 16, lines 1-2, lines 11-21).

Ferrel also discloses a means to edit a story thus enabling a proofreader or editor to update all information for a story in the editorial database or publication storage. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 7-15, Figure 5, and Column 23, lines 51-57). Ferrel also discloses a means to search for a story, using a search object, which would enable a proofreader to search for stories in the editorial database. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 48-51). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a means to enable a proofreader or editor to place a story on the website by updating records within the database table structure.

Dabney discloses that an editor can update data within the database to alter the story content. See Dabney, Figure 6, Column 10, lines 23-37, and Column 12, lines 8-24).

Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the editorial

maintenance program of Ferrel with the means of updating database content of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 49.

As per claim 50, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a means for a proofreader or editor to correct key properties of a particular story. Also incorporated into this functionality is the ability to add pertinent properties for each story as determined by a user. Such properties could include author, keywords, town, kicker assignment, and kicker topic. (See Ferrel, Column 22, lines 41-67, Column 23, lines 1-5, and Figure 12). Ferrel does not disclose expressly a means to add, change or eliminate a particular field in the editorial database or publication storage, such as the topic ID, a means to append a story to the end of another story, or a means to replicate a story in the database. Dabney discloses that an editor can update data within the database to alter the story content or location. See Dabney, Figure 6, Column 10, lines 23-37, Column 12, lines 8-24, and Figure 9, element 940). All data in the database can be edited by the means disclosed by Dabney, which includes story content, appending story data from one location to another, and replicating story data from one location to another. (See Dabney, Figure 10, elements 1080 through 1075). Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the editorial maintenance program of Ferrel with the means of updating database content of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an editor to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

As per claim 55, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 54 as described above. Ferrel also discloses that news text electronic data files are associated with available image electronic data files. (See Ferrel, Column 23, lines 58-67, and Column 24, lines 1-10). Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the proofing step can consist of adding, changing or deleting records in the editorial database. Dabney also discloses that data stored in a relational database is maintained and edited by a plurality of content servers (See Dabney, Figure 3B, and Column 7, lines 3-4). The content server allows editors to electronically update the data. (See Dabney, Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-33 and Figure 11). It is inherently true that a relational database structure incorporates the ability to add, change, delete and reorganize records within the database. Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proofing method of Ferrel with the content server programs of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of an interface that would enable an

editor or proofreader to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Figure 11, and Column 15, lines 8-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 55.

As per claim 59, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses an archiving program using containers for multiple projects. This program allows for the extraction, conversion, and storage of the text information. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 38-51, and figure 4). Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the text information is stored in an electronic news archive. Dabney discloses a content management system in which news data presented on the Web is stored in a relational database. (See Dabney, Column 6, lines 33-67, and Column 7, lines 1-33). Since news information is collected and stored electronically on the relational database as disclosed by Dabney, this database serves as an electronic news archive. It is also inherently true that a relational database structure allows for the addition, modification, and deletion or removal of data. Ferrel and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the news text and image translation and composition apparatus of Ferrel with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel for the

benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 59.

Claim 60 is rejected on the same basis as claim 59.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) and Dabney (6,643,663 B1) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162).

As per claim 20, Ferrel and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ferrel also discloses news story text and classification content (See Ferrel, Figure 6), news topic information and news topic classifications (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 402), news section information and news section classifications (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 412), news story source information (See Ferrel, Figure 6, elements 382 and 386, where the source of the news stories listed is shown to be "Reuter"), news story linkage information (See Ferrel, Figure 7, element 422). Ferrel and Dabney do not disclose expressly that the relational database contains geographic classification information. Smith discloses a document management system that contains geographic classification, or zone, information (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Smith also discloses the inclusion of news image caption information, which is presented in the form of headlines and associated photographs (See Smith, Column 16, lines 44-47). Ferrel, Dabney and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting news data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to combine the specific data content information of Ferrel and Smith with the relational database structure of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Also, the motivation for including the geographic data and image caption data of Smith would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content for specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for varying display of specific data relating text to images. (See Smith, Column 16, lines 49-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith, Dabney and Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating, storage and distribution of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Claims 35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) and Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1) as applied to claims 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Dabney (6,643,663 B1).

As per claim 35, Ferrel and Kovack disclose the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Ferrel and Kovack do not disclose expressly that the publication storage resides on a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables"),

is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Kovack, and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the classified advertisements data storage system of Ferrel and Kovack with the relational database storage system of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Kovack for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 35.

As per claim 37, Ferrel and Kovack disclose the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Ferrel and Kovack do not disclose expressly that the death notices database is a relational database supported by a relational database management system. Dabney discloses a content management system that resides on a relational database, which, by definition (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables"), is supported by a relation database management system. (See Dabney, Figure 3B.). Ferrel, Kovack, and Dabney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing newspaper content data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the death notices data of Ferrel and Kovack with the relational database storage system

of Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dabney with Ferrel and Kovack for the benefit of improved updating of stored data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

As per claim 38, Ferrel, Kovack and Dabney disclose the limitations of claim 37 as described above. By definition, the relational database disclosed in claim 37 contains data in the form of tables. (per webopedia.com: "RDBMS: Short for relational database management system and pronounced as separate letters, a type of database management system (DBMS) that stores data in the form of related tables") It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to define a table or set of tables to contain death notice information. The motivation for doing so would have been to separate the death notice information in a relational structure which would provide for easy and efficient data updating and maintenance. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a separate death notices table as a part of the relational database of claim 37 for the benefit of improved data maintenance to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Claim 39 is rejected on the same basis as claims 35 and 37.

Claims 36 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1), Kovack (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1)

and Dabney (6,643,663 B1) as applied to claims 35 and 39 above, and further in view of Reuning (U.S. Patent 6,381,592 B1).

As per claim 36, Ferrel, Kovack and Dabney disclose the limitations of claims 7 and 35 above. Ferrel, Kovack and Dabney do not disclose expressly the inclusion of help wanted or help wanted keyword data. Reuning discloses the inclusion of help wanted data and keyword input upon which to search the data (See Reuning, Column 1, lines 14-18, and Column 3, lines 10-22). Ferrel, Kovack, Dabney and Reuning are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the help wanted data content and keyword information of Reuning with the relational database structure of Ferrel, Kovack, and Dabney. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the implementation of a user interface that would be utilized to easily edit the data contained in the database. (See Dabney, Column 4, lines 10-20). Also the motivation for including the help wanted data and keyword information of Reuning would have been to provide for more efficient job searching techniques using online data (See Reuning, Column 1, lines 18-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reuning, Kovack, Dabney and Ferrel for the benefit of improved updating, storage and distribution of data to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

Claim 40 is rejected on the same basis as claims 36 and 38.

Claims 46 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) as applied to claims 1 and 51 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162) and Weeks (WO 98/470083).

As per claim 46, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a set of containers, containing multiple projects of files, which can be used to categorize data files according to the needs of the user. Ferrel discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification based on multiple data elements or related subject matter in a story. (See Ferrel, Column 14, lines 2-5). Ferrel also discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's classification by using the story's kicker to determine a topic associated with the kicker in the database. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 52-56). Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification using the story's town to determine a topic associated with the town in the database, or by using a weighted count of keywords found to select the topic associated in the database. Smith discloses the use of zones, or geographic locations which includes towns, to determine a publication's circulation area. (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Weeks discloses ranking words within a text to determine the key terms based on a weighted average of occurrences. (See Weeks, page 2, lines 12-13, and page 5, lines 10-16). Ferrel, Smith and Weeks are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data filtering of Ferrel with the geographic classification of Smith and the calculated

keyword occurrence of Weeks. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content classified by specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for improved story classifications based on main topics, thus allowing the reader to find a topic of interest by entering a keyword (See Weeks, page 2, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ferrel, Smith and Weeks for the benefit of improved data distribution within the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 46.

As per claim 53, Ferrel discloses the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Ferrel also discloses a set of containers, containing multiple projects of files, which can be used to categorize data files according to the needs of the user. Ferrel discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification based on multiple data elements or related subject matter in a story. (See Ferrel, Column 14, lines 2-5). Ferrel also discloses that the containers could be used to determine a story's classification by using the story's kicker to determine a topic associated with the kicker in the database. (See Ferrel, Column 13, lines 52-56). Ferrel does not disclose expressly that the containers could be used to determine a story's topic classification using the story's town to determine a topic associated with the town in the database, or by using a weighted count of keywords found to select the topic associated in the database. Smith discloses the use of zones, or geographic locations which includes towns, to determine a publication's circulation area. (See Smith, Column 9, lines 37-56, and Column 11, lines 42-51). Weeks discloses ranking words within a text to determine the key terms based on a weighted average of occurrences. (See Weeks, page 2, lines

Art Unit: 2176

12-13, and page 5, lines 10-16). Ferrel, Smith and Weeks are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting data electronically. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the data filtering of Ferrel with the geographic classification of Smith and the calculated keyword occurrence of Weeks. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for enhanced distribution of publication, based on content classified by specific areas or regions, (See Smith, Column 9, lines 42-46), and to allow for improved story classifications based on main topics, thus allowing the reader to find a topic of interest by entering a keyword (See Weeks, page 2, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ferrel, Smith and Weeks for the benefit of improved data distribution within the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 53.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Ferrel (U.S. Patent 5,907,837) discloses an information retrieval system that separates content from design.
- Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) discloses an automatic method and system for retrieving information based on a user-defined profile.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is 703-605-

Art Unit: 2176

1238. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAR


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER